Approved For Release 2005/02/10 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200160069-6

stated that they will not insist upon the discharge petition as indicated in the letter from National Commander Kime:

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I
OF THE U.S.A., INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1964.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: At the briefing last Friday, July 31, on proposed changes in veterans' pension laws, those present in your office, in addition to yourself and Mr. Meadows, were Francis Stover and Jimmie Van Zandt from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, John Erickson and I from Veterans of World War I.

My information is that the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Veteran Compensation and Pension have, this morning, reported the proposed bill to the full committee, which I understand will meet tomorrow.

As stated to you on July 2: "If the House Veterans' Affairs Committee will come out with a good bill, you will not hear anything more from national headquarters about discharge petition No. 4 during my administration."

With the information proposed in the present bill, reported by the subcommittee, I repeat the above statement, and in addition in our official publication, the Torch, and through a bulletin to all national and department officers, will make every effort possible to gain support of the proposed bill after it has been voted out of the full committee.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. KIME,
National Commander.

The bill has 12 sections and is effective, generally, on January 1, 1965.

Section 1 provides six new exclusions from income in determining pension eligibility:

First, 10 percent of the payments to an individual under any public or private retirement, annuity, or income plan. Example: social security being received by the veteran in the amount of $1,800 a year—$180 of this sum, or 10 percent, would be excluded in determining income eligibility. This would not operate, however, in contributory pension plans until an individual receiving pension on October 31, 1964, had recouped his contribution.

Second, amounts paid by the veteran for the last illness and burial of his deceased spouse or child.

Third, profit from the disposition of real or personal property other than in the course of business.

Fourth, payments received as a result of jury duty or other obligatory civic obligations.

Fifth, payments under the war orphans educational assistance program.

Sixth, bonus or similar payments from a State.

Section 2 removes the requirement that a child file a report every year showing annual income received during the preceding year.

Section 3. Under Veterans' Administration pension regulations a veteran, in order to receive pension at age 65, in addition to meeting the income requirements must be unemployable, and have a 10-percent disability. Section 3 would remove the requirement of a 10-percent disability as well as unemployability attributed thereto.

Section 4 provides increases shown in the tables which follow—existing law in black brackets, new matter proposed in the bill in italic.

Veterans without dependents

[Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	Equal to or but less than—	
$600 1,200	$600 1,200 1,800	$85 70 40]

Column I		*Column II*
Annual income		
More than—	*Equal to or but less than—*	
$800 *1,300*	*$800* *1,300* *1,800*	*$90* *70* *40*

Veterans with dependents

[Column I		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income		One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
More than—	Equal to or but less than—			
$1,000 2,000	$1,000 2,000 3,000	$90 75 45	$95 75 45	$100 75 45]

Column I		*Column II*	*Column III*	*Column IV*
Annual income		*One dependent*	*Two dependents*	*Three or more dependents*
More than—	*Equal to or but less than—*			
$1,200 *2,200*	*$1,200* *2,200* *3,000*	*$100* *75* *45*	*$105* *75* *45*	*$110* *75* *45*

Widows without dependents

[Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	Equal to or but less than—	
$600 1,200	$600 1,200 1,800	$60 45 25]

Column I		*Column II*
Annual income		
More than—	*Equal to or but less than—*	
$800 *1,300*	*$800* *1,300* *1,800*	*$65* *45* *25*

Widow with one dependent

[Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	Equal to or but less than—	
$1,000 2,000	$1,000 2,000 3,000	$75 60 40]

Column I		*Column II*
Annual income		
More than—	*Equal to or but less than—*	
$1,200 *2,200*	*$1,200* *2,200* *3,000*	*$80* *60* *40*

Section 5 increases the additional allowance for aid and attendance cases from $70 to $100.

Section 6 provides a new rate of $35 additional to any veteran who is permanently housebound.

Section 7. Existing law excludes $1,200 of the wife's income and counts the balance in determining the veteran's eligibility for pension where the veteran is married. The amendment would exclude $1,200 or all earned income whichever is the greater.

Section 8 provides the same sort of protection for the non-service-connected aid and attendance pension cases as is now available for the service-connected cases receiving compensation under 38 United States Code 314(r). That is, the allowance shall not be discontinued until the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of the admission for VA hospitalization rather than immediately as is the case today. This section also makes similar provisions for aid and attendance compensation allowances under provisions other than 314(r).

Section 9 authorizes individuals who are receiving aid and attendance pension allowances provided by 38 United States Code 521(d) to be furnished drugs or medicine which are prescribed by a physician.

Section 10 makes a technical correction to existing law to make certain that a widow may not receive more than an award of death pension on account of the service of her husband in more than one war.

Section 11 permits the same 10 percent exclusion factor described in section 1 for the "old law" cases—pensioners under law in effect on June 30, 1960.

Section 12. The bill is generally effective January 1, 1965, except that the section relating to recoupment shall not apply to any individual receiving pension on October 31, 1964, until his contributions have been recouped.

BEEF IMPORTS

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

Approved For Release 2005/02/10 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200160069-6

Approved For Release 2005/02/10 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200160069-6

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is good to know that the Rules Committee followed the wise suggestion of Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the Ways and Means Committee that the controversial "beef import" restriction bill be sent to conference. It is certainly important that such a forum have the opportunity to discuss many of the vital questions which are raised by this issue.

For instance, there should be a careful review of what the proposal might do to our general trade negotiations. Los Angeles, for example, has many firms whose export trade might be severely affected by any unwise and precipitous action, and the overall trade picture needs to be taken into consideration. We should also assess the possible retaliation that could come from such countries as Australia and Argentina, again in the context of our overall export trade and balance-of-payments position.

In the agricultural area, what is the possible effect on such export products as cotton, rice, tobacco, and soybeans? Equally important, what would unreasonable legislation do to the consumer prices of lower cost meat and meat products and the cost of living of low-income families?

I have never been unsympathetic to the needs of any special group, and especially this group, but I am hopeful that there is a middle position which will not adversely affect the much wider interests involved, including jobs in our port areas, in the shipping industry, in the storage industry, and in the processing industry.

I am confident that under Chairman MILLS' direction, all factors will be given fair consideration, and I commend the majority of the Rules Committee for a wise decision.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 196 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and voted "yea," and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THIS PAPER TIGER HAS CLAWS AND TEETH

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the action of President Johnson in ordering a prompt and vigorous strike on North Vietnam torpedo boat bases will evoke hearty applause. Too long have we turned the other cheek when actions of aggression on our planes and ships occurred. This is language which the Communists can understand and respect and which the American people have long wanted.

The action of Vietminh in attacking U.S. destroyers was an obvious test of U.S. determination. They have boasted that the United States is a paper tiger. Now they know this is no paper tiger; it has teeth and claws and will use them. There is, of course, the chance that action will spread. We have to take the risk. Had we failed to make vigorous response, the message to our friends would have been loud and clear.

It must be recognized that the willingness of the Vietcong forces to provoke this incident indicates that the day of a showdown over Vietnam may not be very distant. The tide has been running against South Vietnam for a number of months. There has been a substantial buildup of Vietcong forces there, and they are fighting with new vigor and effectiveness. The United States is still hopeful this situation can be checked and the Vietcong actions reversed without spreading the conflict or without an all-out commitment of U.S. forces. Regardless of the outcome of the incidents of the past few days, a new look may soon be necessary to determine whether Vietnam can be saved without a sterner effort on our part.

Sometimes we are tempted to relax our vigilance. Sometimes we wonder about the necessity of spending half of each tax dollar for defense. Sometimes there are those who decry the emphasis on military over civilian activities. These are the times and these are the conditions which prove the wisdom of our course. Without a strong defense we would long ago have been pushed aside by the Communist war lords. But it is equally necessary to show a willingness to use that military strength when there is a justification. Indecision, lack of determination, unwillingness to risk a showdown, negate a strong defense. The enemy wants trouble no more than we. But in too many instances we have let him face us down. I hope there will be no more of this.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 196 of Thursday, July 30, a quorum call, I answered "present." I am marked absent. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as not voting on rollcall No. 200, defense appropriations conference report.

When this rollcall was taken, I was at the office of General LeMay in the Pentagon attending the presentation ceremony of the 1963 Cheney Award posthumously awarded to Maj. James O'Neill, a resident of my district who was killed in Vietnam last year in performance of his duties with the U.S. Air Force.

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted "Aye."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. HALL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SECURITIES ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1964

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6793) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6793), with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] had 19 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] had 16 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] was discussing the problem outlined in the minority report having to do with the particular section of the bill dealing with "marketmakers." During his discussion the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] raised some questions regarding that particular section and in addition thereto the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] had raised another question concerning foreign securities as treated in this bill.

Since then I have had occasion to discuss the matter further with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] and with the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I have today received a letter addressed to me regarding three specific issues, one having to do with the foreign corporations that would be requested to register and file reports, one having to do with the domestic companies refusing to register and file reports, and another which expressed concern about section 16(d) with reference to the profit-recovery provision, having to do, as I said a moment ago, with "marketmakers." This letter explains and clarifies further the questions that were raised yesterday. I

Approved For Release 2005/02/10 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200160069-6